UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
-v-	JUDGMENT INCLUDING SENTENCE
·	UNDER THE SENTENCING REFORM ACT
RICHARD PITCHER	CACE AND COLOR
x	CASE NUMBER: CR-03-1368 (ARR)
	101-05 LEFFERTS BOULEVARD, SUITE 207 RICHMOND HILL, NEW YORK 11419
	Defendant's Attorney & Address
THE DEFENDANT:	Address
XXX was found guilty on counts one	& two of the superseding indictment a plea of not
guilty.	of not
Accordingly, the defendant is AD	JUDGED guilty of such count(s), which involve the
TITLE & SECTION 21 USC 952(a), 963, CONSPIRACY	OFFENSE COUNT NUMBER(S)
21 05C 952(a), 963, CONSPIRAC	Y TO IMPORT ONE (1)
960 (a) (1) & AT LEAST 1 960 (b) (1) (B)	FIVE KILOGRAMS OF COCAINE.
~~~ \~/ \~/ \~/	
21 USC 846, 841(a)(1) & CONSPIRACY	Y TO DISTRIBUTE TWO (2)
POSSESS 1	WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE AT LEAST EITH WIT COLORS
OF COCAINE.	
The sentence is imposed numerous to the	d in pages 2 through of this Judgment.
The sentence is imposed pursuant to the	e Sentencing Reform Act of 1984.
The defendant has been found not to such count(s).	guilty on count(s) and is discharged as
XXX Remaining counts are dismissed or	n the motion of the United States.
	2DT 6b61}
assessment of \$200.00 which shall	to the United States a special be due XXX immediately as follows:
It is funther opposes as	as lollows.
district within 30 days as	t shall notify the United States Attorney for this
restitution, costs, and special assess	t shall notify the United States Attorney for this of residence or mailing address until all fines, ments imposed by this Judgment are fully paid.
Defendant's Soc. Sec #NONE	
"	APRIL 12, 2006
Defendant's Date of Birth 8/1/65	Data of Imposition of Sentence
Defendant's Mailing Address:	ALLYNE R. ROSS, U.S.D.J.
2801 DOVER STREET	APRIL 12, 2006
	Date
PISCATAWAY, NEW JERSEY 08854	Date
	A TRUE COPY ATTEST
Defendant's Residence Address:	Date:
/ asses ====	ROBERT C. HEINEMANN
( SAME AS ABOVE )	CLERK OF COURT
	<u>-</u>
	By:
	DEPUTY CLERK

Defendant: RICHARD PITCHER Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page

of

## IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of one hundred twenty (120) months. On both counts of the superseding indictment, to run concurrently.

<u> </u>	The Court makes the following recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons: THAT THE DEFT BE HOUSED AT THE FORT DIX OR ALLENWOOD FACILITY.
	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal. The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for this district,
	ata.m./p.m. on as notified by the Marshal.
	The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons
	before 12:00 noon on
	as notified by the United States Marshal.
	as notified by the Probation Office.
	RETURN
	I have executed this Judgment as follows:
efend	dant delivered on to at at, with a certified copy of this Judgment.
efen	dant delivered on to at, with a certified copy of this Judgment.  United States Marshal

Defendant: RICHARD PITCHER Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page

0:

## SUPERVISED RELEASE

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be on supervised release for a term of five (5) years.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall not commit another Federal, state, or local crime and shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court (set forth on the following page). If this judgment imposes a restitution obligation, it shall be a condition of supervised release that the defendant pay any such restitution that remains unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release. The defendant shall comply with the following additional conditions:

- 1) IF EXCLUDED; DEFT SHALL NOT RE-ENTER THE UNITED STATES ILLEGALLY.
- 2) DEFT SHALL NOT POSSESS ANY FIREARMS.

The defendant shall pay any fines that remain unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release.

Defendant:RICHARD PITCHER Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page of

## STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

While the defendant is on probation or supervised release pursuant to this Judgment:

- The defendant shall not commit another Federal, state or local crime; 1)
- the defendant shall not leave the judicial district without the permission of the 2) court or probation officer;
- the defendant shall report to the probation officer as directed by the court or 3) probation officer and shall submit a truthful and complete written report within the first five days of each month;
- the defendant shall answer truthfully all inquiries by the probation officer and 4) follow the instructions of the probation officer;
- the defendant shall support his or her dependents and meet other family 5) responsibilities;
- the defendant shall work regularly at a lawful occupation unless excused by the 6) probation officer for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons;
- the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of any 7) change in residence or employment;
- the defendant shall refrain from excessive use of alcohol and shall not purchase, 8) possess, use, distribute, or administer any narcotic or other controlled substance, or any paraphernalia related to such substances, except as prescribed by a physician; 9)
- the defendant shall not frequent places where controlled substances are illegally sold, used, distributed, or administered;
- the defendant shall not associate with any persons engaged in criminal activity, 10) and shall not associate with any person convicted of a felony unless granted permission to do so by the probation officer;
- the defendant shall permit a probation officer to visit him or her at any time at 11) home or elsewhere and shall permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view by the probation officer;
- the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of being 12) arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer; 13)
- the defendant shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informer or a special agent of a law enforcement agency without the permission of the court;
- as directed by the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of 14) risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history or characteristics, and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification

These conditions are in addition to any other conditions imposed by this Judgment.

Defendant: RICHARD PITCHER Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR) Judgment - Page o FINE WITH SPECIAL ASSESSMENT The defendant shall pay to the United States the sum of \$_200.00____, consisting of a fine of \$ N/A and a special assessment of \$ 200.00 These amounts are the totals of the fines and assessments imposed on individual This sum shall be paid ___ immediately ___ as follows: The Court has determined that the defendant does not have the ability to XXXpay any fines, cost of confinement or supervision. The interest requirement is waived. The interest requirement is modified as follows:

THE COURT: There are two guidelines issues remaining in this case; first the base offense level of the offense based on the amount of narcotics the defendant reasonably understood to be the subject of the conspiracy; and second, whether the defendant should be subject to an aggravating role enhancement.

As to the first issue, the base offense level, I am persuaded by a review of the trial evidence that the government is correct that the evidence establishes by a preponderance that the defendant reasonably understood and foresaw that the intended amount of narcotics to be imported and distributed exceeded 50 kilograms of cocaine resulting under the guidelines in a base offense level of 36.

This is so notwithstanding the fact that as the government acknowledges, no specific narcotics seizure has been linked to the defendant's involvement. I reach this conclusion based in part on the following evidence. Although there is no evidence that Mr. Pitcher was himself a party to Lall's 2002 importations of cocaine with Sandy, Kenny Hall and Cleveland Green on Universal Airlines from Trinidad and Guyana, these importations shed light on Mr. Pitcher's understanding of the amounts of cocaine intended to be imported in connection with Lall's 2003 schemes in which the defendant clearly participated.

Based upon an October 2002 seizure of more than

50 kilograms of cocaine coupled with other evidence presented, it is inferable that the prior five importations in this scheme also involved cocaine and may also have involved like quantities of that drug.

In May of the following year, 2003, when Lall told Sandy of his intent to recommence these cocaine importations, Pitcher's tape recorded conversations with Lall make clear that he too was by then a member of the conspiracy functioning as a liaison between Lall and his suppliers in Guyana and Trinidad.

In those tape recorded conversations defendant and Lall discuss various methods to be used in importing the cocaine, the same methods clearly identified in earlier conversations enabling importation of 50 to more than 150 kilograms of cocaine at one time.

Similarly, in August-September of 2003, after
Williams on behalf of Lall enlisted Dennis to import cocaine
from Trinidad and Guyana via North American Airlines, Lall's
contemporaneous tape recorded telephone conversations with
Pitcher established that Pitcher again functioned as a liaison
between Lall and the suppliers and conversed with Lall about
methods to be used in importations contemplating shipments of
multiple kilograms. Audio taped evidence also established
that Lall and Pitcher explored other routes, sources and
airlines for future importations including drugs from Peru via

Lan Chile and from Trinidad via Miami Air.

Also strongly probative of Pitcher's understanding that the importation conspiracy with Lall involved more than 50 kilograms of cocaine was Government's Exhibit 38, a list of source countries, routes, airlines and methods of importation believed to have been written by Lall and found in Pitcher's car.

The methods of importation identified on the list "pallet or back wall or box in the middle," were all as established by other evidence used to impart large quantities of narcotics.

All of the above evidence viewed together with defendant's admissions at his arrest that he functioned as Lall's contact with the drug suppliers and took part in subsequent drug distributions compels the conclusion that as the government argues, Pitcher foresaw that his importation and distribution conspiracy with Lall and others encompassed at least 50 kilograms of cocaine.

Under the advisory guidelines, the defendant's base offense level is 36. On the other hand, I find the record evidence insufficient to support any role enhancement. The evidence makes clear that, as defendant himself admitted, he functioned as a liaison between Lall and Lall's suppliers. The evidence established his role to be that of a contact person. He communicated Lall's inquiries and directives to

the supplies and communicated the suppliers' responses to Lall. Nothing in the record suggests that defendant ever enlisted a supplier. Indeed, nothing disputed defendant's admission that it was actually a supplier who introduced defendant to Lall.

Although the tape recordings make clear that Pitcher actively schemed with Lall regarding the planning of the shipments, there is no suggestion in any conversation that defendant in any way functioned as a decision-maker or that he recruited any coconspirator or that he managed or supervised any other person. There is no suggestion that he exercised any control over any coconspirator or any aspect of the scheme. Absent such evidence, there can be no basis for a role enhancement.

Apparently aware of the weakness of its argument that the defendant functioned as a manager or supervisor, the government urges in the alternative that I upwardly depart because the defendant "nonetheless, exercised management responsibilities over property, assets or activities of a criminal organization". But just as there is no evidence that defendant exercised control over or directed any coconspirators, there is also no evidence that he exercised management responsibilities over the property, assets or activities of the conspiracy.

Notably, too, there is no evidence of what, if any,

compensation defendant earned for his participation and there is certainly no evidence that he had a proprietary interest in the narcotics that were the subject of the scheme.

In light of these facts, no role enhancement is warranted under 3B1.1 notwithstanding the significance of defendant's role in transmitting information back and forth between Lall and Lall's suppliers, notwithstanding defendant's demonstrated interest in assisting Lall in finding new airlines and importation routes, and notwithstanding the evidence that the defendant was fully aware of the nature and scope of the criminal enterprise.

I therefore calculate defendant's advisory guidelines as follows: A base offense level of 36, a deduction of two levels for the safety valve resulting in a level 34, criminal history category one, carrying a range of imprisonment under the advisory guidelines of 151 to 188 months.

MR. D'ALESSANDRO: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt. The government has been constrained in its sentencing submissions because we were operating that there was going to be no application for the safety valve.

Now that they are making the application, the government should be able to provide the Court with a record of the defendant's safety valve statements.

THE COURT: That's why I tried to clarify that

ALLAN R. SHERMAN, CSR, RPR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Eastern District of New York

before.

MR. D'ALESSANDRO: But there was never a question as to whether or not if there was no role enhancement, he could qualify. He clearly met with the government. That was one of the things we were operating under at trial.

In conversations with defense counsel, it was made clear that he is not applying for safety valve. Now that they are making the -- so I couldn't refer to it in the statements and I put it in as a footnote to the letter that I can't provide the Court with direct evidence as to amounts of drugs or anything else.

Admittedly, I haven't looked at the safety valve proffer in some time. There may be nothing in there that alters the Court's ultimate decision in the matter, but if we are going to make a decision based on what is in fact part of the record --

THE COURT: Let me ask Mr. Lombardino, do you want it or don't you want it? If we do it, I think Mr.

D'Alessandro is right.

MR. LOMBARDINO: I do too, your Honor, that's why I thought I made it clear in the beginning that I was not seeking the safety valve.

Your Honor propounded a question --

THE COURT: I guess I'm asking you now. I agree with Mr. D'Alessandro that if I give him the safety valve, he

is entitled to tell me what was in the proffer. So my question to you is: Which way do you and your client want to go?

MR. LOMBARDINO: As I've stated all along, then I have to restrain from asking for that because I think it would be more harmful to my clients.

THE COURT: That is fine.

Let me adjust that and say that he is a base offense level of 36, carrying an advisory guideline of 188 to 235 months.

As required by Section 3553(a), I have considered the advisory guidelines. The nature and circumstances of the offense have already been addressed. The crime is a very serious one, though the nature and extent of defendant's participation does not appear to exacerbate the seriousness of his offense.

The conspiracy was conducted without weapons or violence and unlike many of his coconspirators, the defendant who is not an airport employee did not make use of his position in carrying out the crime.

Turning to the history and characteristics of the defendant, Mr. Pitcher is a 40 year old illegal alien from Trinidad and Tobago. He and his girlfriend have four children ages 17 to 6, all of whom are in school. The defendant's girlfriend and sister together purchased a home in New Jersey

where his family now lives.

Prior to defendant's arrest, he financially supported his girlfriend and their four children. The defendant's girlfriend now works as a sales representative earning \$33,000 gross per year.

Although defendant's girlfriend is employed, her income is noted as not great and imposition of a very lengthy period of incarceration on defendant will no doubt pose significant financial and emotional strain on her and their children as documented in defendant's sentencing memorandum.

Defendant has no prior convictions and in fact has never before had a brush with the law. In order to support his family, he has maintained a steady employment history as a factory worker, a car salesman, a clothing merchant and most recently a steam pipefitter. As an illegal alien, he will unquestionably be deported to Trinidad upon his release from incarceration.

Given all of the factors pertaining to the defendant and his offenses, I believe that a sentence of 120 months imprisonment which is the statutory mandatory minimum is of ample severity to accomplish the goals of sentencing enumerated in the statute.

A sentence of 10 years is in my view extremely severe, thus insuring just punishment for defendant's serious offenses. It also serves the goal of both specific and

2 inevitable deportation insures the safety of the public and 3 provides sufficient assurance against recidivism. Δ Accordingly, on counts one and two, I sentence the 5 defendant to the custody of the Attorney General for a period of 120 months to run concurrently, to be followed by a five 6 7 year period of supervised release with special conditions that if deported, he not illegally reenter the United States and I R 9 prohibit the possession of a firearm. 10 I make a finding that he is unable to pay a fine but 11 I will impose the mandatory 200-dollar special assessment. 12 Mr. Pitcher, as you know, you may appeal both the 13 conviction and the sentence and notice of appeal must be filed 14 within 10 days. 15 Mr. Lombardino, are you retained? MR. LOMBARDINO: I am, your Honor, but he has 16 17 retained appellate counsel. He has retained appellate 18 counsel. 19 THE COURT: You have already retained appelate 20 counsel? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Because I was going to tell you if you 23 couldn't afford it, the Court would appoint someone to 24 represent you on appeal.

general deterrence and particularly in view of defendant's

1

25

ALLAN R. SHERMAN, CSR, RPR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Eastern District of New York

THE DEFENDANT: I spoke to a lawyer and she told me

that she would do it.

THE COURT: It's up to you. If you can afford it, that is fine. If you couldn't afford it, the Court would appoint a lawyer for you.

The application will be made. I don't appoint the lawyer. It's the Court of Appeals that does it but if that were the case, if you qualified financially, if you qualified financially for the appointment of counsel, and I don't know if you do, you and Mr. Lombardino have a better idea of that, you would have to fill out a financial affidavit and undoubtedly the Court of Appeals would make a determination about your financial eligibility and if so, it would appoint a lawyer to represent you.

You don't get a free lawyer unless you can't afford it.

Okay?

Mr. Lombardino, have you thought about a designation for Mr. Pitcher?

MR. LOMBARDINO: I have thought about a designation.

I was hoping your Honor would suggest somewhere in Allenwood.

I think that is the closest, or Fort Dix. I would say Fort

Dix if that is possible.

THE COURT: I will recommend Fort Dix or if that is not possible, Allenwood or someplace as close as possible to his family in New Jersey.

MR. D'ALESSANDRO: Your Honor, the defendant was convicted of a superseding indictment. There were no outstanding counts as to that but as to all underlying indictments, we would move that they be dismissed. THE COURT: Granted. (Matter concluded.)